

From: Brian Hauss
Sent: Thursday, October 09, 2003 10:08 AM
To: Dabbs, Paul
Subject: Some initial comments/suggestions on 160-03

Paul,

I have a few preliminary comments and suggestions for Bulletin 160-03. I would ask that you thoughtfully consider them, but I understand the timelines and deadlines that the Bulletin must adhere to, so if some of my thoughts cannot be addressed, I do understand. Thanks.

Executive Summary/Chapter 1 Introduction

Does the "Investment Guide to Meet 2030 Water Demands" medium implementation confidence line item for Surface Storage include the proposed Temperance Flat off-stream San Joaquin River storage? As I understand the project, it might provide an additional 1MAF of additional storage, and this does not appear to be in the 1MAF of total potential benefits. Along these lines, are the Sites Reservoir and proposed enhancements to Folsom storage also included in this line item? It seems, at the very least, that the additional storage at Folsom should be included.

Chapter 2

Page 2-12

In the discussion on transfers, the text states: . . . hundreds transfers (totaling thousands of acre-feet . . .), and I would suggest that this reference would more accurately be described as hundreds of transfers totaling hundreds of thousands of acre-feet.

Page 2-16

The second full paragraph should have the title of "Lack of funding to implement management strategies" **in bold**.

Pages 2-19 and 2-22 and the Executive Summary 1-1

The use of the word overdraft is sometimes broken into two words and sometimes listed as one word. I would suggest that you be consistent, however you chose to write out the word(s).

Figure 2-1

Although this map is already fairly full, I think it would be important to include Los Vaqueros Reservoir and Diamond Valley Reservoir as local projects given their relative importance within their regions.

Page 3-3

AB2587 does create the need ensure that California Agriculture maintains its status as producer for the state, nation and world. How can the Bulletin really meet this requirement without assigning a higher priority to additional surface water storage? It almost appears that the Bulletin, through the Investment Guide and additional narratives throughout, focuses on what has the greatest chance for implementation, instead of what *should* be done for the state to address future growth and needs. Without additional storage, more water will have to come from agriculture to meet Urban, Environment and Tribal needs and this does not seem consistent with AB2587, does it, really?

In addition, I would also note that surface water storage should also be given a greater priority not only to sustain agriculture, but also to help mitigate some of the real problems that could evolve as a result of changing climate conditions and global warming. While it may not be popular, and while the Bulletin even states that additional storage consensus could not be reached, I think additional storage is a critical investment that must be made, and this storage, while expensive, does provide a synergy of benefits. Storage provides new yield for project population growth, it should provide water for agricultural, environmental, tribal and urban uses. New storage also captures additional run-off (global warming), protects against flood events, and could/should provide additional energy and recreational benefits.

I guess my point, indirectly through the discussion of AB2587 and agriculture, is that additional storage should have a higher priority within the “wise” investment list that this state should be encouraged to consider. Storage may not seem as feasible from a purely economic standpoint, but additional storage is critical “to provide for our growing population, to maintain agriculture and a healthy economy, and restore our environment.” (From the introduction in Chapter 1). This state has made some investments that had great risks associated with them, but these investments have paid great dividends.

Thanks again for your consideration of these comments.